

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26. Claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 25 and 26 are amended herein, and new claim 27 is added. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,336 (Ladd) and U.S. Patent No. 6,801,604 (Maes).

Independent claim 1 recites, “augmenting the speech recognition system by providing an augmenting grammar set supplied by a first speech recognizer of a portal to a second speech recognizer” and “transferring control over user interaction to the second speech recognizer independent of the portal.” Claim 1 further recites, “notifying the portal in response to an input which corresponds to the augmenting grammar set responsive to speech recognition executed via the second speech recognizer independent of the portal” and thereby “transferring control over the user interaction to the portal and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal.”

Independent claim 8 recites, “a portal having a first speech recognizer” and “an application server having a second speech recognizer to receive an augmenting grammar set transmitted from the first speech recognizer of the portal, the application server controlling user interaction.” Claim 8 further recites that the application server “notifies the portal in response to an input which corresponds to the augmenting grammar set” including “transferring control over the user interaction to the portal” to perform “subsequent speech recognition at the portal.” Independent claim 20 recites similar features.

Independent claim 17 recites, “connecting a call to a portal having a first speech recognizer”, “requesting services of a remote application server having a second speech recognizer via the call” and “transmitting an augmenting grammar set of the first speech recognizer from the portal to the remote application server.” The call is then connected to the application server “transferring control of the call including user interaction to the remote application server” and “breaking the connection between the call and the portal.” When an input during the call is determined to correspond to the grammar set “in accordance with speech recognition executed via the second speech recognizer”, control over the call “including the user

interaction" is transferred back to the portal to perform "subsequent speech recognition at the portal."

Claim 25 recites, "transferring control over caller interaction to the first speech recognizer of the application server" and "switching control of the caller interaction from the application server to the portal responsive to detection of an input corresponding to the grammar set via the second speech recognizer of the application server." As such, "subsequent speech recognition" is performed "at the portal."

Independent claim 26 also recites, "determining whether the call includes an input corresponding to the transferred grammar set based on speech recognition controlled by the application server, said determining being while the portal is handling other calls." As such, the method includes, "returning control of the call back to the portal subsequent to determining that said input corresponds to the transferred grammar set..." and performs "subsequent speech recognition related to interaction with a caller at the portal."

The Examiner relies on Ladd as teaching augmenting the speech system with grammar set supplied by the portal and notifying the portal. In Ladd, the VRU server (234) of the electronic network processes speech communications and provides output signals representing the result of the speech processing (see, col. 8, lines 55-67).

The Examiner, however, maintains the comparison of the claimed portal with the electronic network discussed in Ladd. The output signals representing the result of speech processing are routed to an application server (242) or a voice browser (250) to implement specific functions associated therewith (see, col. 8, lines 55-67 and col. 9, lines 35-38). In contrast, the claimed "notifying" pertains to notifying the portal.

On page 12 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Maes teaches passing temporary control to perform speech recognition. The Examiner points to elements 80-82 of Fig. 7 in Maes as teaching temporary passage of control where the original program had initial control.

When an incoming call is received, Maes assigns an application instance to the call and an application accepts the call (see, col. 15, line 43-49, 54-64). Then, based on the application request for resources, the task manager sends a message to the router requesting addresses for the requested speech services such as TTS, ASR, grammars, vocabularies (see, col. 15, line 65 through col. 16, line 7). The task manager requests the synthesizer to play something, tells the recognizer to recognize something, gathers the recognized word and collects the responses

and then gives the results to the application (see, col. 16, lines 12-26). The application then processes the results (see, col. 16, lines 32-40). That is, Maes is limited to outsourcing the audio stream to be processed while the application server maintains control over the audio and is provided with results of the recognition.

Maes purports use of speech resources where applications configure and control the audio processing engines and receive remotely processed results. In particular, Maes explicitly states:

"speech engines (e.g., speech recognition) and audio I/O systems are implemented as programmable services that can be asynchronously programmed by an application using a standard, extensible SERCP (speech engine remote control protocol)"

(see, col. 3, lines 52-60 of Maes).

"In general, a preferred SERCP is limited to speech engine remote control. **The call control functions are preferably left to the application or to a system/load manager.** In other words, SERCP preferably does not provide redirection decision mechanisms or mechanisms to redirect a call. SERCP only specifies how to remotely control an engine (with the engine and the RTP stream (RT-DSR) well-identified)."

(see, col. 23, lines 15-25 of Maes).

"The considerations made above raise fundamental issues in terms of standardization and interoperability. SERCP is preferably able (target-1) to replace a speech engine provided by one speech vendors by an engine provided by another and still be able to run immediately the same speech application without any other change and (target-2) **enables speech applications to control remote speech engines** using a standardized mechanism but messages tuned to the controlled speech engines (emphasis added)."

(see, col. 29, lines 43-51 of Maes).

As discussed above, the remote speech engines are controlled by the application using SERCP messages. The application in Maes is still in control (i.e., the ASR is being controlled, and fed audio, by other entities), and thus, fails to teach or suggest transfer of control to the portal and implementation of user interaction using the portal, as taught by the claimed invention.

Ladd and Maes, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest transferring control over "caller [or user] interaction" to a portal based on determination that an input of the caller matches a "grammar set provided by the portal" in accordance with speech recognition independent of the portal, as taught by the claimed invention (see above discussion of claims).

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Ladd and Maes.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Ladd and Maes. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 12 recites, "wherein in response to an input being recognized as corresponding to the augmenting grammar set, control of the call is transferred from the application server to the portal."

Ladd and Maes, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above-discussed features including "implementing interaction" with a caller using the portal when during a call, speech recognition executed independent of the portal indicates an input matches the grammar set supplied by the portal (see above discussion of claims).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM:**

New claim 27 has been added to recite, "determining an input from a caller matches a grammar set supplied by a portal, said determining being during interaction of the caller controlled by an application server independent of voice recognition by the portal." Claim 27 further recites, "implementing subsequent voice recognition via the portal by controlling interaction of the caller using the portal responsive to said determining."

Ladd and Maes, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above features of claim 27 including determining "an input from a caller matches a grammar set supplied by a portal... **during interaction of the caller controlled by an application server independent of voice recognition by the portal**" and "controlling interaction of the caller using the portal responsive to said determining" (emphasis added).

It is submitted that new claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over Ladd and Maes.

**CONCLUSION:**

Accordingly, claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 25 and 26 are amended and claim 27 is added. Claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 04/03/2007

By:

Temnit Afework  
Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501